

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 15-18 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 15, and 18 being independent. Claims 1, 2, and 15 have been amended. Claim 18 has been newly added. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments and new claim do not include new matter.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,826,313 (Robar et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,005 (Yoshida), U.S. Patent No. 6,563,535 (Anderson), U.S. Patent No. 5,414,811 (Parulski et al.), and knowledge allegedly well known in the art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of reading a plurality of film originals, each being mounted with a slide mount, which are placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus in a plurality of orientations, comprising, *inter alia*, an image reading step and a display orientation setting step. The image reading step includes reading each of a plurality of film originals placed on the original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation. The display orientation setting step sets a display orientation for all of a plurality of generated image signals, by one setting.

Independent Claim 15, as amended, recites a system for reading a plurality of film originals, each being mounted with a slide mount, which are placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus in a plurality of orientations, comprising, *inter alia*, features similar to those recited in independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 18 recites a method for reading a plurality of originals placed on an original support comprising, *inter alia*, an image reading step and a display orientation setting step. The image reading step reads each of the images of the plurality of originals placed on the original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation, and cuts out image areas to generate a plurality of image signals. The display orientation setting step sets a display orientation of all of the plurality of image signals to a landscape display or to a portrait display, by one setting.

Robar et al., Yoshida, Anderson, and Parulski et al. are cited in the Office Action as allegedly collectively disclosing the features of Applicant's invention. Robar et al. relates to a system that includes digitizing films into images. Robar et al. discloses simultaneously scanning a set of four films, and extracting individual images. *See* Fig. 6 and Col. 6, lines 10-24. Robar et al. also discloses rotating and/or flipping each image so that it is properly oriented. *See* Fig. 7A-7D and Col. 6, line 66 through Col. 7, line 9.

However, the rotation and/or flipping of each image in Robar et al. merely refers to re-orienting a portrait image to a corrected portrait image. In particular, Robar et al. discloses that when the image of Fig. 7A is a properly oriented image, scanned images that appear as Figs. 7B and 7D are flipped vertically and horizontally, respectively. Meanwhile, a scanned image that appears as Fig. 7C is rotated by 180 degrees. *See* Col. 6, line 66 through Col. 7, line 9.

As such, Robar et al. merely discloses the reading of film originals in a portrait orientation, but cannot be understood to disclose or suggest reading film originals placed on an original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation.

Yoshida relates to an image processing apparatus with a blank space determined according to a size of a recording paper. Yoshida discloses checking whether all received

information is A4 portrait size (step S70), A5 landscape size (step S82), A4 landscape size (step S104), or A5 portrait size (step S116). *See* Figs. 5-6. Yoshida also discloses a length-to-width conversion for two pages in succession of A5 image information, to record the two pagee on a single page of recording paper with a blank space. *See* Col. 10, lines 7-17.

However, the system of Yoshida likewise cannot be understood to disclose or suggest simultaneously reading originals placed on an original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation. Additionally, while Yoshida may disclose performing a length-to-width conversion when two successive pages are of A5 portrait size, Yoshida cannot be understood to disclose or suggest setting a display orientation for all of a plurality of generated image signals, by one setting. For instance, if two sheets of A5 portrait size include an A4 size sheet therebetween, the A5 portrait size sheets do not undergo a length-to-width conversion as they are not successive pages.

Anderson relates to an image processing system for a digital camera. Anderson discloses a rotation sensor 112 so that captured images can be automatically rotated to a desired landscape or portrait format for display. *See* Col. 5, lines 52-55.

However, Anderson likewise cannot be understood to disclose or suggest simultaneously reading originals placed on an original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation, inasmuch as the system in Anderson at least does not relate to a mixed manner of landscape orientation and portrait orientation among simultaneously read originals.

Parulski et al. relates to an apparatus for controlling rapid display of multiple images. Parulski et al. discloses reading a set of image frames on a 35mm film strip 10, by scanning using a film scanner 12. *See* Col. 5, line 65 through Col. 6, line 2.

Since a film strip contains images all of the same orientation (*see, e.g.*, the depiction of filmstrip 10 in Fig. 1 of Parulski et al. as containing all landscape images), Parulski et al. can at most be understood to read originals in a single orientation. However, Parulski et al. cannot be understood to disclose or suggest simultaneously reading originals placed on an original support in a mixed manner with a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation.

Applicant additionally submits that even assuming, *arguendo*, that the proposed combination of the applied references is proper, the proposed combination does not disclose the features recited in independent Claims 1, 15, and 18.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 15, and 18 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2, 5, 6, 16, and 17 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen K Yam/

Stephen K. Yam
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 64,927

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SKY:SMW:ayr